(1)

(5)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 566 /2004

PETITIONER

Rameshwak Raisagar, Son of Late Govind Ram Rai Sagar, aged about 54 years, Sub Divisional Officer (Electrical / Mechanical), F.O.M., Sub Division, Water Resources Department, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

P. R. No. 567/04
Presented by Shri A.R. Yadav
dated 20/12/04

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through : the Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (CG)

RECEIVED-COPY
20/12/04
Clerk to A.G. Bilaspur

2. K.G. Gupta, Superintending Engineer, Hasdeo Project Circle, Rampur, distt. Korba (CG)

3. J.N. Gupta, Executive Engineer (Electrical / Mechanical) Minimata Bango Dam, Division, Machadoli, Distt. Korba (Chhattisgarh)

शपथ आयुक्त
बिलासपुर (छ.ग.)

4. P.N. Hore, Superintending Engineer, Minimata, Bango Canal, Circle No.2, Head Quarter at Janjgir, Distt. Champa-Janjgir (Chhattisgarh)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITITON OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF THE WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTIORARI AND FOR OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT / WRITS, DIRECTION / DIRECTIONS, ORDER AND ORDERS.

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 566 of 2004

155

Petitioner Ram Sewak Raisagar

Versus

Respondents State of Chhattisgarh and others

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri J.S. Baraik, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri Manish Upadhyay, Panel lawyer for the respondent No. 1/State.

ORAL ORDER

(5th April, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The present petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India impugns the suspension order dated 23.1.2004 (Annexure P/1).
2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the impugned suspension order dated 23.1.2004 has been revoked by the respondent No. 1 and as such nothing survives in this matter and the matter has become infructuous.
3. In regard to prayer 7.2, the petitioner claims damages from 7.2 to 7.4, this prayer cannot be granted under writ jurisdiction as it involves claim of damages from the respondents No. 2, 3 and 4.
4. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu